

**Opening Remarks**  
**By U.S. Representative Judy Biggert (R-IL-13<sup>th</sup>)**  
***Department of Energy's Plan for Climate Change Technology Programs***  
**Committee on Science**  
**Wednesday September 20, 2006**

The hearing will come to order. I want to welcome you to this Energy Subcommittee hearing examining the Department of Energy's strategic plan for the Climate Change Technology Program. Our essential question, at this point, is was it worth the wait?

Let me start by reviewing a bit of the history here. On June 11, 2001, President Bush announced two initiatives to address climate change. Those initiatives are now known as the Climate Change Technology Program – CCTP – and the Climate Change Science Program – CCSP. The Administration has said that these initiatives form the core of its policy to fulfill the U.S. commitment to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

The Administration's admirable work on the Science Program can serve as a model for how best to shape a research program so it delivers results. Beginning in July 2002, the Department of Commerce undertook the process of preparing a new 10-year strategic plan for the CCSP. Science Program managers engaged national and international stakeholders in a comprehensive review of research and observational systems needs. CCSP submitted its November 2002 draft strategic plan to the National Academy of Sciences for review and to the public for comment. A December 2002 workshop, attended by 1,300 scientists and other participants from 47 states and 36 nations, facilitated extensive discussion and debate.

By July 2003, the CCSP strategic plan was complete. This open and orderly process established a research agenda that has been universally supported and will fill the gaps in our knowledge and understanding of the earth's climate.

Today, the Commerce Department is executing its CCSP strategic plan. The first of 21 synthesis and assessment reports was released in May of this year. And just this week, the Secretary of Commerce announced a new Federal Advisory Committee to provide advice as the remaining reports are developed.

Why did I go into this degree of detail for the CCSP when the topic of our hearing today is the CCTP? Because the thoughtful, deliberate, open process the Administration employed to develop the CCSP gave Congress and others the confidence that the \$1.7 billion program is on the right track.

Can I say the same thing about the \$2.9 billion Technology Program? Unfortunately, no. Compared to CCSP, the Technology Program appears stalled near the starting line. It is now September 2006 – four years and two months after the deadline former DOE Under Secretary Robert Card set for release of the draft technology plan – and the revised plan is being released today. That is unacceptable. This hearing should be examining progress in year three of that plan.

Don't get me wrong; I strongly support the Administration's stated policy of addressing climate change through technology development. Technology investments are like an insurance policy against climate change. Supporting a diverse portfolio of climate change technologies such as energy efficiency, carbon sequestration, and carbon-neutral energy technologies – including nuclear energy – will provide us with the most insurance coverage for the best price. We have a lot riding on this R&D portfolio. Not only are we relying on it to help reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, we need it to secure America's energy independence.

As Chair of the Subcommittee with oversight responsibility for nearly 90 percent of the programs included in CCTP, I know that research and technology are, by and large, non-controversial ways we can start addressing climate change now. That's why I am determined to see progress on this front.

Since the July 2002 deadline for the release of the initial plan, the Administration has announced a whole series of energy technology research initiatives: the Hydrogen Fuel Initiative, the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, the fusion experiment ITER, and the Advanced Energy Initiative. These are all great energy initiatives that I enthusiastically support. At the same time, in the absence of a rigorous, well-vetted, comprehensible plan, Congress is left to figure out how and to what degree each of these technologies – individually and collectively – will contribute to achieving our climate change goals. This information is critical if Congress is to make informed decisions about how best to allocate technology development resources to address the problem of climate change.

We want DOE to succeed – we need DOE to succeed. I think it would be terribly unfair to our children and grandchildren to leave the Earth in worse condition than the way in which we received it. That is why the government, the research community, and industry must work together to develop technology solutions that make environmental and economic sense. But for such a collaborative effort to succeed, we need a solid game plan.

I think my colleagues share that sentiment. We want FutureGen, GNEP, sequestration, and all the other climate change technologies to work and to work well. We have high expectations. We believe those expectations can be met with a clear strategic plan.

With that, let's get down to the business of today's hearing. Fundamentally, we want to know whether the strategic plan can be used to guide R&D investment decisions and whether it will enable the United States to achieve the Administration's stated goals. Most importantly and I cannot stress this enough, we want to know how the CCTP plan and DOE's planning process can be improved. I look forward to the discussion.

I want to thank the witnesses for sharing their expertise with us today, particularly Professor Hoffert, who graciously agreed to our invitation to serve on this panel at a very late hour. We will make Professor Hoffert's written testimony available within a few days. Professor Dan Kammen of the University of California at Berkeley, originally scheduled as a witness, is not able to attend today due to a last minute scheduling conflict. I greatly appreciate his willingness to serve as a witness each time we tried to schedule this hearing in the past. We have made his prepared testimony available and it will be entered into the hearing record.